

REMARKS

Claims 1-37 remain in the application and claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Burns et al. in view of Cooper et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Burns et al. and Cooper et al. fail to show or suggest the recited "first identification storing unit in which first identification data that is unique to an equipment and second identification data corresponding to said first identification data has been stored," and "a second identification storing unit in which the second identification data corresponding to said transmitted first identification data has been stored."

The Office Action at paragraph 6 concedes that Burns et al. is silent about the first identification data being unique to an equipment and cites Cooper et al. as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that in the cited prior art is necessary to transmit the second identification data (decryption key), whereas in the presently claimed invention it is not necessary because the first identification storing unit already has the second identification data stored therein as the description key. An advantage resulting in a more

system is that the first signal processing unit is able to decode the data transmitted through the second transmitting/receiving unit based on the second identification data stored in the first identification storing unit.

Further, another feature of the present invention described in the paragraph bridging pages 16-17 and now recited in amended independent claims 1, 4, and 27, is that the first identification storing unit is formed in a single IC, thereby making it more difficult to obtain the decryption key by an unauthorized individual. The cited prior art is also silent about this further feature of the present invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 4, and 27, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Burns et al. in view of Cooper et al.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb